

OCT 09 2007

Accused Politics of INTENTIONAL Complications for Brigandage must be stopped finally by US Government

FAX: 1-571-273-8300

FOR OBLIGATORY FORMAL REGISTRATION: Appl. 10/508967 (PCT/IB03/03315)

Commissioner for Patents

Dr. Y. Zagjansky, Entraide, 22 rue Ste Marthe

P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia

75010 Paris France

22313-1450 USA

Paris, 08th October 2007.

Mr. Jon Dudas (personally), Representative of US GOVERNMENT, Director of USPTO (copies to USPTO Top).

Dear Sir, *This is proving example of "fantastical" intentional arbitrary politics of US GOVERNMENT to hide classically behind long demagoguery already not "for boys", where nobody in such Governmental Office answers already. IT PROOVES AGAIN unavoidable accused COMPLETE INTENTIONAL BRIGANDAGE OF ALL MY APPLICATIONS BY US GOVERNMENT by special reasons.*

Even already seeing (in my Fax of 08/28/07 in "Register") COPY OF CERTIFICATE ("Received, USPTO Mail Center"), specially delivered by USPTO, Examiner INTENTIONALLY IGNORES IT and instead he is writing long demagoguery about "Notice of Abandonment" after received answer (moreover sent by me in two parallel letters). He even does not explain why he did not take the received post (2 copies!!!) from "Mail Center". It is too impertinent and open for Patent costing millions. In such complete jeering of demonstrative absence of law and unpunishment, .. (see copy of

again of Certificate of Receiving by USPTO), I wait USPTO answer for this detailed answer of 03/22/07. Sincerely Dr. Y. Zagjansky

P.S.(1) Under above open jeering of absence of law, you can consider above text as "Petition to the Director" under §1.181a (37 CFR). [37 CFR §1.137 is OPENLY not my case because my answer was not only written but received (with your Certificate) by USPTO and loss of even two parallel copies BY STATE is impossible normally except intentional stealing as crime of the same Government as de facto the above INTENTIONALITY].

P.S.(2) In very strange coinciding, the normal size envelopes (for A4) were FIRSTLY absent at all in "my" "usual" shop like I could send my heavy letters (134g) in too loosen envelop that their content could be some lost. Without doubt, I sent both letters in "A4" envelope and I ALWAYS enforce all envelop borders by scotch (around) against impossible loss. Is it again International sophisticated cooperation of Thieves under US Government?

P.S.(3) One can suppose that such too primitive initial censuring (at "Register") (with such above jeering openly to ignore it) of my letter (03/22/07) is due to PROVEN "Perfectly legal system of my Claims" (§4 of 03/22/07). Due to very intentional unclearness (because Examiner knew that he is wrong a priori (accusation), I could only guess my answer (§4). [If Examiner wrote really about it (§4), it must be intentional crime of intentional unclearness for Brigandage without telling really the reasons that moreover were knowingly wrong!]. But as International plot, one can observe it (NEWLY) with all my Applications of ALL United States. And now Public must see it. SO we see such impossible complications now! (Accusations). P.S.(4) Again intentionally, Examiner (as all others like by Totalitarian following) answers indirectly for my question about proofs of my receiving of USPTO letter, that cannot lead to abandonment (with 1000\$ of loss) in the case of its nonreceiving [see P.S. of my Fax of 08/28/07 about 37 CFR §1.8 (§512 MPEP)]. What proofs finally should have USPTO that its NONREGISTERED letter was not received? Is last USPTO's letter must be registered or Applicant should state it under honour? And why this ambiguity intentionally rests in GOV!! USPTO Legislation? Firstly, it is not the same as to see Register, where the letter could be not put in Register (as in this too logical case of this RECEIVED letter with Certificate as DE FACTO IN EPO), nonaccessibility of Register, that sometimes takes place etc. Secondly, there are A NUMBER of cases of such accused Governmental Brigandage with majority of my applications that took place before new System of Register. In the positive for Applicant case (Registered letter or under Honour), it must be intentional crime of Totalitarian hiding (by ALL Examiners) to cover intentionally crimes. Thank you for too simple direct explanation (of P.S. of 08/28/07).

Yuf Page

Ex. USA, Alexandria, Virginia
22313-1450 USA (P.O. Box)

PROV: USA

RECEIVED
OCT 9 2007

95293
23/03/2007
DR. Y. ZAGJANSKY, Entraide,
22 rue Ste Marthe
03-ANR-2007

BEST AVAILABLE COPY